DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 616 UD 016 064

AUTHOR Henderson, Ronald D.
TITLE Busing: Implications for Social Change in Urban and Rural Areas.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 1976); Tables 1-3 may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bus Transportation; *Change Agents; Change Strategies; Educational Change; Educationally Disadvantaged; Futures (of Society); *Integration Effects; Public Policy; *Racial Integration; *Racial Segregation; Rural Areas; *Social Action; *Social Change; Social Integration; Social Problems; Sociocultural Patterns; Urban Areas

ABSTRACT

Busing is examined as a tool of social change in the alteration of school structure from racial segregation to racial integration. A commentary is provided on the nexus between social change in education and other aspects of society and the utilization of busing as a tool of social change. Information is also presented on schools in urban and rural areas status in regard to desegregation and integration. An important perspective of this delineation is whether busing will facilitate social change. To highlight conceptualization of social change as it relates to desegregation, integration and busing time frame charts are presented. The rationale postulated is that commitment is needed from other sectors of society in order to facilitate change. Open housing and adoptation of schools to desegregate student bodies is suggested as possible strategies along with busing to facilitate social change in education and ultimately the total society. Without meaningful dedication to the goal of integration from other sectors of society, busing alone may be a waste of effort, time and money. Most importantly, the physical and psychological well-being of students may be jeopardized. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED124616

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Busing: Implications for Social Change in Urban and Rural Areas

Ronald D. Henderson

University of Florida

11.16

UD 016 064

BUSING: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL CHANGE IN URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

Social change is basically the addition of traits or patterns to a culture, producing alterations in the social structure. Cultures are changed primarily in two major ways; by diffusion (acquisition of traits or patterns from other cultures) and invention or discovery of new cultural elements within the society.

The transportation of school children has been used to facilitate change in education. A salient example was the rural school consolidation movement, in which mass pupil transportation was a key element in bringing about social change (Henderson and Gomez, 1975). However, the fact that white pupils were transported past black schools provides a dual perspective in which to examine the transportation of children. On the one hand, busing was a tool of social change, on the other it was a vehicle for societal stability--racial segregation in schools.

The current paramount issue in education is whether busing can be the social change element to take our society from separatism to integration. Because the intermediary stage of desegregation has failed to produce meaningful alterations of the social structure, it does not qualify as social change. Indeed, under the guise of desegregation, numerous vestiges of separatist ideology and practice have usually flourished. The result of true social change in education would be the presence of school environments where all role incumbents would engage in the educational process (e.g., socialization-training and selection-allocation) without the organization, resource allocation, task performance, and outcomes being segregative or discriminatory. Hopefully, this would result in quality education for all students. True social change occurs with

integration because the racial social structure of schools is completely altered. In effect, race will not be a factor in role, status, and achievement attained within schools and ultimately the society.

The intent of this paper is to examine busing as a tool of social change in the alteration of school structure from racial segregation to racial integration. Commentary will be provided on the nexus between social change in education and other aspects of society and the utilizationof busing as a tool of social change. Information will be presented on schools in urban and rural areas status in regard to desegregation and integration. An important perspective of this delineation is whether busing will facilitate social change. To highlight conceptualization of social change as it relates to desegregation, integration and busing, time frame charts will be presented.

Education and Social Change

Education has been charged with an enormous task, the integration of whites and blacks. This charge is quite intricate and monumental in that education is interwoven with all aspects of the social structure. Political, religious, and family institutions are all related to education. Even more clearly interwoven to education are the systems of social class stratification, mobility, and the opprotunity structure (Brookover and Erickson, 1975). Essentially, education is being asked to provide leadership for change, while other aspects of society are not ready for that change. Olive Banks, (1968:217) provides the following excellent commentary on this perspective:

> It is possible that at least part of the problem lies in the way the question is framed. The concept of education as producing or impeding social change is enormously complicated by the fact that the educational system is itself a part of the society which it is changing.

Busing: A Tool of Social Change

Factors in the emergence of busing for desegregation were indirect, Coleman Report, and direct, Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education. This is not intended to indicate that there were not other variables in operation. The above cited factors were selected because they seemed to have the most impact on the emergence of busing as a tool of social change. The Coleman Report was in effect a "research shot" heard throughout the United States. Essentially, the meaning of "equality of educational opportunity" shifted its focus from school inputs (economic resources going into the school) to school outputs (achievement attained as "results of opportunity"). The key point extrapolated from the Coleman report was the belief that integration would increase minority student performance. This stance was firmly adhered to despite criticism from numerous social scientists, who pointed out the fallacy of utilizing a cross-sectional survey to formulate causal inferences (Young and Bress, 1975).

So the Coleman Report indicated that desegregation was needed to facilitate minority student outputs, which really meant in many school districts pupil reassignment. School attendance zones, residential segregation, spatial segregation, and the sacrosanct aura of the neighborhood school were some of the major problems that had to be resolved in order to bring about the school racial context described in the Coleman Report. Hence, indirectly the Coleman Report called for a tool which would provide schools with a racial makeup conducive to optimum minority student performance.

In Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, the Supreme Court sought to eliminate the dual school system (de jure segregation) in

Charlotte, North Carolina. The court ruled that racially neutral school reorganization plans may not be enough. Busing was approved as the most effective mechanism to bring about desegregation (Wisdom, 1975:145). Therefore what the Coleman Report alluded to indirectly, the Swann decision was a direct edict that busing was the tool needed to bring about desegregation.

Busing programs are somewhat ironic, because heretofore they were utilized to enhance segregation. Now the role was changed in minds of many parents from the "yellow savior" to the new "yellow peril", a new connotation in American racism for the phrase so long used to stir anti-Oriental feelings. Therefore, busing has been used both for societal stabilization and now supposedly change.

Toward Desegregation: Busing as a Mechanism

To further substantiate the possible value of busing as a tool of social change, Foster (1973) indicates the following innovations have been used to desegregate schools: redrawing zone lines, pairing and grouping schools, skip zoning, site selection and construction policies, optional zones, open enrollment, majority to minority transfers, magnet schools, special programs, metropolitan cooperation, and open housing. Ironically, most of these same techniques can also be used to segregate students, as indeed they have been in some cases. However, all of the above mechanisms have basically failed. The main constraints have been the costs of desegregation (such as personnel retraining and transportation expenses), neighborhood school mystique, and the question of academic achievement.

A particularly interesting point about the constraints mentioned

above is the concern about academic achievement. Foster (1973:31) handles this issue most eloquently in the following statement:

> "One of the more interesting aspects of desegregation research is that segregated education was maintained for decades with no insistence that its effectiveness be proved; desegregation, on the other hand, is called upon to remedy overnight the damages of years of segregated schooling."

Desegregation alone should not be viewed as a panacea to ensure quality education. However, desegregation should be viewed as a positive step in the process toward changes in education that may result in quality education. Desegregation also represents a commitment by our society that progress is being made in providing justice and equality to all Americans (Foster, 1973:31).

Busing and Desegregation in Urban Areas

Busing has a rather unique history when urban areas are considered by region. Prior to the 1954 court decision, busing in non-Southern urban school districts, in some instances, had been utilized to maintain segregation. Extensive use was not necessary due to extensive residential segregation, which provided the non-Southern justification of segregation -- de facto conditions. On the other hand Southern urban school districts used transportaion of students via de jure justification to ensure segregation. After the Brown decision, school segregation in non-Southern urban areas began to equal or surpass that in Southern urban areas. This resulted mainly from the eventually effective assault on Southern racism by Northern liberals, while segregation, disguised under de facto justification[1], reigned supreme in the non-Southern urban areas.

What surfaces is that non-Southern urban school districts for the most part are now more successful in separating students by race than Southern

urban school districts. Ironically, Southern urban districts which formally utilized law to achieve segregation, have made considerable progress to reverse their segregation patterns through legal processes. Non-Southern urban school districts have avoided explicit laws and mainly relied on residential segregation to achieve racial isolation in schools. Courts have not arrested the problem of de facto segregation (Green, 1974: 216-217).

Table I about here

In fact, close examination of Table I shows most Southern districts experienced considerable decline of segregation from 1967 to 1972. In most non-Southern districts, decreases in segregation were modest at best. However, two exceptions were San Francisco and Denver, which set up massive cross-busing programs under court order.

The lack of desegregation in non-Southern urban districts bases the entire question of school desegregation on residential segregation. In fact, the isolation of blacks from whites is more complete in Northern areas than ever was present in the South (Grodzins, 1958:5). Given the emphasis on residence as a rationalization for segregation, special note should be made of developments in Southern urban areas. As cited above, with few exceptions, the South is the only area where progress has been made in school desegregation. However, the school officials in Southern urban areas, under pressure from parents and political forces, have begun to utilize the de facto argument to resegregate schools. This trend is especially important since housing segregation is growing fastest in Southern cities (Weinberg, 1964:143).

Prospects for the Future in Urban Areas

Whether busing can bring about social change is a large charge indeed. The outline of historical phases in segregation and desegregation and the interfacing of education with other aspects of society make this task extremely difficult in urban areas. In fact, the open hostility of families, religious groups, and politicians have been joined by the U.S. Supreme Court with the recent decision in the Bradley vs. Milliken case (Lindquist, 1974 and 1975).

This decision was extremely important because it reversed the ruling of the Court of Appeals, which had affirmed Judge Roth of the Federal District Court that it was proper to consider a metropolitan-wide desegregation plan. Judge Roth's ruling was based on his determination that the plaintiff's allegations were indeed true that the Brown decision had been violated by confining black children to schools within the Detroit school district. Roth's ruling on city-suburban segregation was based on the following rationale:

1. Detroit Board of Education through administrative procedures has contributed to continuing black and white pupils in racially segregated schools.
2. State of Michigan *via* refusing to provide support for black pupil transportation in Detroit while providing it elsewhere in the state was contributing to the continual existence of racially identifiable schools.

Reversal of the Bradley vs. Milliken decision by the Supreme Court was based on the following points:

1. The majority and the dissent agreed on the following: a clear pattern of racial separation of Detroit's city and the suburban schools, that the State of Michigan and its agent, the Detroit Board of Education engaged in de jure segregation.
2. In spite of the above areas of agreement, the majority and dissent disagreed on equity. Equity envolves how remedies would be formulated to bring relief from the condition of segregation. The majority asserted that metropolitan remedy surpassed the remedial powers of federal courts. In effect a new legal rule was formulated: "absent an inter-district violation there is no basis for an inter-district remedy," (Lindquist, 1975).

This judicial decision may become as meaningful as Brown. The implied new doctrine may become precedent and substantially limit the amount of school desegregation in urban areas. None the less, busing is absolutely necessary, given the residential patterns that are present in urban areas. Minus the utilization of busing, table 2 shows quite clearly the trend of cities becoming increasingly black with concomitant results in the schools as illustrated in table 3.

Table 2 about here

Table 3 about here

Two school systems in urban areas will be present, one white and one black, separated by sacrosanct school district boundary lines. If the precedent set by the Supreme Court decision is any indication, busing only within city limits (school district boundaries in many urban areas) along with the Rodreguez v. San Antonio decision, (this permits spending differentials between suburbs and cities) could be the conception of what Lindquist (1975: 19) calls the "separate and unequal" period in education.

The future of Southern school districts, whose boundaries are often co-termious with the county, may on the surface seem somewhat brighter. However, with the trend of increasing residential segregation in the South, many districts may opt for de facto rationalization rather than busing, which in turn results in school segregation. A new development that may be pivotal to the aforementioned area of concern is the unanimous decision on April 20, 1976 by the Supreme Court which allows the dispersion of public housing into the suburbs. Only time will permit an assessment of the ramifications of this decision.

Other aspects that call in question whether social change results from busing is what happens after students get off the bus. Detailed explanation of these factors will be presented in the rural sector of this paper. Since county-wide school districts are for the most part a Southern phenomena and rural school integration issues are basically a Southern concern, this discussion seemed more appropriate under that sector.

Busing and Desegregation in Rural Areas

Rural areas of this country have traditionally been pictured as being somewhat conservative in many aspects of social life. In light of the initial and still somewhat mixed reaction to busing that began in conjunction with the consolidation of rural schools (Henderson and Gomez, 1975), the emotions generated by the use of busing as a mechanism for school desegregation need no description. Since desegregation in rural areas was for the most part a Southern phenomenon, the main roadblock was removed with the Brown decision -- de jure segregation. The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, was a significant factor in the cessation of segregation in rural schools. All aspects of the act were important, but certain parts were particularly germane to rural desegregation. One of these was the providing of sanctions that could be used by federal authorities against a system attempting to maintain segregation. Additionally, the Attorney General was given authority to proceed legally against school systems

not in compiance with Title IV. Perhaps most important was the "General Statement of Policies under Title VI of the Civil Rights act of 1964 Respecting Desegregation of Elementary and Secondary Schools." In effect, it specified the type of desegregation plans that were acceptable and timetables for submission of plans and the date for elimination of segregated or dual school systems. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, in conjunction with vigorous action in the courts, contributed to the rapid desegregation of rural schools.

The substantial success of desegregation in towns and small-to-medium cities has been noted by Havighurst (1967). Coleman (1975) outlined desegregation in rural areas in a more refined manner with the following statement:

> Thus policies of reducing school segregation within districts were enormously effective in small districts, almost wholly ineffective in the largest districts (more than 100,000 students), and somewhat effective in districts from 25,000 to 100,000 in size.

Therefore desegregation was in fact achieved in rural areas. Numerous reasons can be formulated for the success in rural areas. The following are selected because they seem germane to the thrust of this paper.

1. Rural areas had developed elaborate busing systems after consolidation that were utilized for segregation. These same systems with route and pupil assignment modifications were invaluable for desegregation.
2. Rural constituents who were for the most part conservative and against desegregation also were fundamentalist and tended to follow the law. This tendency was enhanced when elected federal and state officials supported desegregation because it was the law of the land.

3. Parents in rural areas, due to the small size of the districts, do not feel powerless or impotent in dealing with the school as is often the case in urban school districts. Even though the school their child attended was desegregated, imput into school policy was not considered a problem in rural areas (Coleman, 1975).
4. Rural inhabitants were not rigidly residentially segregated. Numerous white and black children had played together and parents often engaged in informal and formal relationships. Attendance at separate schools was the law and therefore followed. The advent of desegregation did not elicit emotional reactions of the same magnitude that was present in the sectors of the country where residential segregation was a fact of life. The above explanation can also be interpreted in a fashion to substantiate how resistance to school desegregation could also result from the same residential patterns. However, rural whites tended to be poor, realistic, and dutiful. They never had the best of things and knew how to adapt when choices were few.[2]

Prospects for the Future in Rural Areas

Assessing the extent of rural school desegregation at the quantitative level, the situation looks quite encouraging. However qualitatively the situation is not as good as it seems at the aggregate level. The same type of assessment can be made about Southern urban schools and desegregated northern school. Basically vestiges of de jure system are still in evidence. Smith and Grigg (1974: 330-379) have compiled one of the most complete outlines on this phenomenon.

1. Black students still suffer handicaps such as lack of equal protection of the law, inadequate transportation, and use of ability testing to group students.

2. In many school systems, desegregation plans are outdated and in many respects inadequate.
3. Desegregation is often present at the student level, but is grossly inadequate or token at best on the faculty level.
4. Student unrest is quite prevalent in the schools.
   The use of security guards and policemen in schools has deteriorated rather than improved communication between the school and black community.
5. The "pushout syndrome" is one obvious vestige of de jure conditions. Suspension, expulsion, and coerced dropping out of school by students is a widespread phenomenon.[3]
6. To successfully implement desegregation, leadership must come from community leaders, and school officials. Other factors involve racial balance in schools, and a sensitivity on the part of all participants on minority as well as majority constituents concerns who are affected by the plan.
7. One result of the use of ability grouping is the placement of black students in one-race classes. (These classes often represent the lower academic group.) Other factors that facilitate school racial isolation are as follows: (a) school racially imbalanced; (b) classroom placement based on testing, school personnel recommendation, or previous performance; (c) classes set up for skill deficient enhancement; (d) student's selection of classes; (e) racial insensitivity; and (f) a possible overarching truism is that educators unprepared for black students opt for the easiest solution, separation of race and culture into groups which fit the preconceived educable ideal and others.

8. The counseler's role in this situation is an uneviable one, even in the best situation. Course assignment of students and counseling for college represent the two main areas where major problems have surfaced in desegrated settings.

9. The most callous symbol of white insensitivity to blacks is the closing of schools for blacks. These schools, products of a dual system to begin with, were in most cases either inadequate or in a place not suitable for a school. Therefore, with the advent of desegregation, these edifices which had developed into focal points of the black community, were eliminated. A crucial point is that blacks had no part in the decision-making process in the building of schools for blacks or in their closing.

10. Another particulary vexing result of desegregation is the displacement/demotion of black principals. The same problem was also present with black athletic coaches in high schools. In some states even the number of black teachers began to decrease, especially in rural areas.[4]

11. The advent of desegregation also prompted the opening of private segregated schools. This has proved to be one factor in the declining white enrollment. Even schools affiliated with religious groups have openly stated their schools are "oasis" from desegregation.

12. Perhaps even more important is the step, form desegregation to integration. In most desegregated school districts the step has not been taken (Mercer, Coleman, and Harloe, 1974: 274-329; Wolf and Simon, 1975; and Orfield, 1975).

Just superficial examination of the above points illustrate very clearly that the desegregation success from the numerical perspective leaves a lot to be desired at the operational level, especially if you are black. Please keep in mind that all desegregated schools do not fit the model described

above. In fact, desegregation has been a success in some schools. Rationale for the above discussion partially resides in the fact that schools in which desegregation is a success, (integration), are the exception not the norm.

Social Change, Desegregation and Busing: A Realistic Appraisal

Examination of the plethora of issues and developments in education from the end of the Civil War to Plessy v. Ferguson to Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka to Bradley v. Milliken by lay and many learned observers would probably conclude that social change has occurred. This kind of summative appraisal precludes taking into account that school desegregation was supposed to bring about integration. Basically, the "integration hypothesis" assumed that improvements in black motivation, academic performance, and self-conception would result. The second part of the hypothesis was that race relations would be improved, based on assumption of the "contact theory". The assumption being that after different groups of people are brought together and interact with "equal status", the post-interaction relationships will be improved over the pre-interaction relationships (Young and Bress, 1975; Allport, 1954). Given the information presented in this paper and the excellent review of school desegregation by Nancy St. John (1975), neither of these two goals has been realized.

What has been accomplished, mainly in the urban South and rural areas, is desegregation, which is a process of relocating children to obtain racial balance. Whereas integration, which is students, parents, and teachers interacting within the school environment to enhance the development of roles, statuses, and achievements that are equitable to all.has not been realized.

The content of this paper illustrated the minimal progress toward school desegregation in some sectors of the country and the almost complete absence of integration. To fully capture the dynamics of desegregation, integration,

and social change, time frame analysis, a technique extrapolated from Gorman (1971:87-94) will be utilized. An integral part of the charts developed will be the functions of American schools as identified by Spady (1974:36-77). These components should be scrutinized since changes in them may bring about subsequent alterations in the racial structure of schools and perhaps ultimately the society. To enhance examination of the charts, brief exposes of each function as espoused by Spady (1974:36-77) are as follows:

1. The most general and primary function of the school is instruction. Instruction is the systematic attempt of school personnel to provide activities that will enable students to increase their information base and cognitive skills. This would include development of all the basic skills which are considered part of any school curriculum and numerous other ideologies, values, and so on which are considered part of American society.
2. Socialization is the fundamental goal of the school. In fact, instruction is a sub-set of the socialization mission of the school. It is only through acquisition of the proper attitudes, values, beliefs and expectations that the skills acquired or enhanced via instruction are able to be utilized in a socially acceptable way. In short, socialization attaches appropriate cultural significance and utilization to the outputs that result from instruction.
3. A particularly problematic function of schools is custody-control. Schools are charged with the task of instruction up to a certain age regardless of the students' desire to participate. This places schools and students in a situation where neither has a viable option. The subsequent effect is that both the school staff and students are engaged in interactions which have a profound effect on instruction. In fact, the emphasis is often on student control rather than instruction.

Therefore control in many situations is the end product of school activities rather than the means to an end, instruction.

4. Certification supposedly represents that a student has obtained minimal proficiencies in the required curriculum. In many instances, this purported level of skill attainment is not present. However, the utilitarian value of a diploma cannot be questioned. A diploma is analagous to a "union card"; it usually opens employment doors, it often determines initial position or rank, and it may be a factor in determining salary.

5. The selection function of schools has an affect on life chances and learning opportunities of students in two ways. First, internal selection involves access to educational programs due to tracking. Second, external selection may result due to differential evaluation and grading of students in similar programs with the same certification. Outside agencies and schools will select those students who are most qualified from the group of students who received diplomas.

The time periods utilized in the charts were extrapolated from Mercer, Coleman, and Harloe (1974: 274-329) who provided commentary on the utility of these epochs in examining racial isolation in American public schools. These authors also contend that racial isolation in American schools is present in some form throughout America, although its manifestation and justification differs. Time frame analysis charts will not be constructed for area and regional comparisons. Rationale is that although differences may be present in the integration process, the degree is not significant enough to warrant separate analysis. The purpose of time frame analysis is to outline general overall trends in American public schools regarding school functions as they

relate to the integration process. These functions have outcomes for children which can be categorized somewhere along the segregation to integration continuum.

These outcomes can be present in any time period regardless of the racial makeup of the school. Segregative type outcomes can be either segregation or neosegregation depending on the racial mix of the schools. In the confines of this paper, segregation outcomes are present in schools that are racially homogeneous. Neosegregation outcomes are usually found in desegregated schools. Hence, neosegregation represents the "chameleon" like ability of segregation to persist despite the changes in the schools' racial populations. The following commentary involves some examples of student outcomes that result from school functions that are either segregation or neosegregation. (1) Instruction-Unequal information acquisition and cognitive improvement for black students in comparison to white students. (2) Socialization - The acquisition of "socially acceptable or unacceptable" behavior by students which solidifies a social structure that accentuates white superordination. (3) Control - The emphasis on control of black students is exacerbated to the extent that instruction-socialization is not the primary focus of the school. (4) Certification - A diploma has differential value for black and white students with regard to the proficiency level of skills that were obtained. (5) Selection - Black and white students do not have equal access to school programs. This in turn, effects opportunities for higher education and employment. Integration would involve the cessation of school functions which result in school outcomes that are segregative and mitigate against quality education for all students. What usually occurs in desegregated schools is neosegregation or in some instances minimal integration.

Minimal integration usually benefits some middle class and extremely talented lower class black students.

Chart 1 illustrates that true social change has not occured in U.S. public schools. School function's outcomes are not the same in the various time periods. For example, socialization outcomes proceed from segregation to minimal integration and trends indicate a probable return to segregation. Selection outcomes across time periods go from segregation to neosegregation to minimal integration to neosegregation and trends also indicate a return to segregation. One point remains salient in an overall examination of Chart 1. School function's outcomes do not reach the stage of maximum integration or true social change. Indeed, there is evidence which indicates a return to segregation. What has occured thus far in U.S. public schools is cyclic change or in reality no change. There are aspects of chart 1 which could be questioned, such as the phases of tne integration process which are depicted as outcomes for the school functions. However, regardless of varied points of conjecture

Chart 1 about here

The information conveyed by Chart 1 is further substantiated by Chart 2 which gives examples of mechanisms (e.g. tracking and social promotion), procedures (e.g. IQ test and elimination of black school, principals, teachers, and coaches), and personnel (e.g. security guards and counselors) which facilitate desegregated schools' functions to have the same results that were present in segregated schools. In other words, Chart 2 outlines how the functions of desegregated schools result in the same educational outcomes (neosegregation) for black students even though schools have been desegregated. Thus, change in the school functions from the pre to post Brown decision are clearly delineated by examples of neosegregation or at best minimal integration. For example, certification and selection in segregated schools usually resulted in diplomas of unequal value with concomitant unequal access to higher education

and employment for black students. This situation has not changed to any significant degree in desegregated schools. Certification still means that students have various levels of academic proficiency which, in turn, provides limited access to higher education and employment opportunities. So another method of depicting change in American schools is maintenance change (See chart 2). The education system functions maintain the same outcomes for black and white students, even though aspects of the system (i.e. school racial population) have changed. In fact, some blacks posit that schools for blacks were better during the pre-1954 era, as opposed to the present situation.

Chart 2 about here

Time frame analysis has clearly illustrated that true social change (integration) has not taken place in U. S. public schools with regard to the outcomes of school functions. Social change in the desegregation process is supposed to reach fruition via realization of the integration hypothesis. Brown v. Board of Education was supposed to be the beginning of this process. Busing is considered a key factor to facilitate this transformation (Swarn v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education). Obviously, U. S. public schools still have a long, difficult road ahead to integration.

The Road to Integration

Given the present societal reactions to busing, the continual use of schools alone, as the proverbial "head of the arrow" in the pursuit of integration may be tenuous. Schools have usually been stabilizers rather than enhancers of change (Jones, 1974). What seems logical and more realistic in probability of success if for other aspects of society to join education in the quest for integration. Banks' (1968: 217) statement that education is complicated in promoting or impeding change because it is encased within society is paramount to an understanding why a total societal commitment may be invaluable. In

very simple terms, most components of society must want and actively work for integration, otherwise resistance will surface under numerous guises and continually subvert the process.

In order to bring about the type of integrated school milieu which was alluded to above, the most feasible alternatives at the present time are to concentrate on housing desegregation, adaptation of schools to desegregated student bodies, and busing. A modus operandi such as this will prevent putting all the integration eggs in one basket -- busing. This is crucial given the societal backlash against busing and the conditions present in most desegregated schools. One area of particular importance is housing given the pervasive residential segregation in urban areas and the implications of the Milliken v. Bradley decision. Another essential point is the possible affect on academic achievement. Crain and Weisman (1972: 183) indicate that for integration to have maximum impact on black achievement, it must begin in childhood. Therefore, residential integration may be a means of realizing schools that coincide with the "neighborhood school mystique" and are integrated. In fact, Hermalin and Farley (1973), having examined the 1970 census, conclude that many blacks can now afford to live in suburbia. Additionally, as mentioned previously, a possible step to facilitate residential desegregation may be present in the recent (April 20, 1976) Supreme Court decision that sanctions the construction of low-income housing in suburbs. Therefore, St. John's (1975: 130) argument that revitalizing the fair housing movement may make it possible for housing to share the burden of desegregation along with schools is a logical one. Perhaps even more important, the open housing approach seems to be more pragmatic. Income redistribution recommendations such as a negative income tax or anti-employment discrimination laws sound promising in theory; but, may be difficult to put into practice. Fair housing laws coupled with anti-employment discrimination legislation, and also affirmative action in

all aspects). Orfield (1975: 317) outlines several areas of educational concern that should be addressed in school desegregation plans.

1. Teachers must be willing to change their teaching methods. Even more crucial is alterations in expectations about student performance.
2. Principals play a pivotal role in the desegregation process via their leadership role in the community and the school..
3. Teachers must be sufficiently trained (not just exposed) to new curriculum materials. An important point is that the fact of skin color does not instantly certify a teacher to teach minority-oriented materials.
4. Whenever possible, children should be desegregated at the lowest age possible. There seems to be a positive relationship between the age at which students are desegregated and the level of problems that occur after desegregation.
5. All individuals involved in the desegregation process must keep in mind that they are engaged in a process that usually takes a variable period of time to show progress or true social change.
6. In areas where non-English speaking students are present, provisions must be made for bilingual programs. Whenever possible, the bilingual program should be an integral part of the curriculum.

The educational concerns cited above represent by no means all the issues that must be addressed to structure or maintain an integrated school. Equal status contact (Cohen, 1975), personality outcomes (Epps, 1975), suspensions and expulsions (Yudof, 1975), and all the areas of concern cited earlier from a paper by Smith and Grigg (1974) must also be reconciled to

provide for an integrated school environment. However, strategies suggested in this paper may eliminate or at least minimize some of the aforementioned concerns.

Efforts must be made in many areas or busing and/or any other innovation will be subverted, as has been the case, for the most part, in prior desegregation efforts. Hopefully, societal reformers and educators will realize the flaws present in educational reform strategy and mobilize efforts in housing and other spheres of society, along with busing. To do otherwise may be a waste of time, money, efforts, and the physical/psychological well-being of students.

Footnotes

1. De facto justification for school segregation in the north is the object of considerable investigation. Evidence has illustrated clearly that state and local school officials, discriminatory housing pa terns, and employment policies have actually fostered de jure segregation in the non-south. In short, there is no such thing as de facto justification for school segregation. The base line rationale for school segregation throughout the country is de jure in the final analysis.
2. This information was obtained in part from conversations with Professors Margaret Howie and Joseph Vandiver, of South Carolina State and University of Florida, respectively. The interpretation presented is totally the responsibility of the author.
3. A more comprehensive look at this phenomenon is fully explored in the Southern Regional Report, "Blacks Target of Pushout."
4. In depth information regarding the displacement of black school personnel in respective states can be found in the Southern Regional Report, "It's Not Over in the South" and in articles such as "The Status of Florida's Black School Principals," by Everett E. Abney and "Black Educators in Louisiana--A Question of Survival" by Marvin J. Berlowitz. Both articles are in The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 43, Winter, 1974.

CHART I

CYCLIC CHANGE IN UNITED STATES FUNCTIONS AS RELATED TO THE INTEGRATION PROCESS

School Role	Time					
	Post Civil War 1870-1894	Dual Education System 1894-1954	Court-Ordered Desegregation 1954-1964	Legislative & Judicial Thrust 1964-1970	Executive Retrenchment 1970 --	Apparent Trend In Urban Schools Post Bradley v. Milliken 1974 --
Instruction	Segregation	Segregation	Minimal Integration	Minimal Integration	Minimal Integration	Segregation
Socialization	Segregation	Segregation	Minimal Integration	Minimal Integration	Minimal Integration	Segregation
Certification	Segregation	Segregation	Neo-segregation	Neo-segregation	Neo-segregation	Segregation
Selection	Segregation	Segregation	Neo-segregation	Minimal Integration	Neo-segregation	Segregation
Custody-Control	Segregation	Segregation	Neo-segregation	Neo-segregation	Neo-segregation	Segregation

C H A R T II

MAINTENANCE CHANGE IN UNITED STATES SCHOOL FUNCTIONS AS RELATED TO THE INTEGRATION PROCESS

School Functions	Time	
Instruction	Pre-Court Ordered Desegregation	Post-Court Ordered Desegregation
	Segregation	IQ Testing, Tracking, Inequality of School Thruputs and Outputs, School Disruptions
Socialization	Segregation	Low Self-Concept, Heighten Anxiety, Loss of Black Schools, Loss of Black Principals, Coaches, Teachers, Use of Police in Schools in an Invective Manner, and Lack of Equal Protection of the Law in Schools
Certification	Segregation	Social Promotion, High Dropout Rates, and Expulsions
Selection	Segregation	Tracking, Differential Evaluation and Grading, and Role of Counselor in Class, Career, and College Selection
Custody-Control	Segregation	Expulsions, Suspensions, and Corporal Punishment

Note: Most of the material in this chart was extrapolated from Bill Spady, "The Authority System of the School and Student Unrest: A Theoretical Exploration," and Charles U. Smith and Charles M. Grigg, "Public School Desegregation in the South"; both are in Uses of the Sociology of Education, edited by C. Wayne Gordon.

Table I - Indexes of Racial Segregation of Students in the Public Elementary Schools of the Largest Cities of the North and South, 1967, 1970 and 1972.

Southern Districts	1967	1970	1972	Change	Northern Districts	1967	1970	1972	Change
Houston	92	86	80	-12	New York	52	53	54	+2
Baltimore	87	87	89	+2	Chicago	92	92	93	+1
Dallas	92	93	89	-3	Los Angeles	89	88	87	-1
Washington	77	80	81	+4	Philadelphia	76	79	81	+5
San Antonio	88	81	78	-10	Detroit	79	80	78	-1
Memphis	95	90	86	-9	Cleveland	90	91	92	+2
St. Louis	91	88	92	+1	Indianapolis	85	84	81	-4
New Orleans	87	82	80	-7	Milwaukee	88	87	84	-4
Jacksonville	92	79	22	-70	San Francisco	67	63	20	-47
Kansas City, Mo.	79	85	86	+7	San Diego	78	72	70	-8
Atlanta	95	84	81	-14	Boston	74	74	74	0
Nashville	85	83	37	-48	Columbus	81	80	76	-5
Fort Worth	93	91	73	-20	Seattle	65	62	62	-3
Oklahoma City	97	88	25	-72	Pittsburgh	72	85	74	+2
Louisville	76	86	87	+11	Denver	82	65	58	-24
					Regional Averages				
					(N - 58)				
									(N - 85)

Source: U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics, Directory: Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Large Districts: Fall, 1967: U.S. Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts: Fall, 1970; Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts: Fall, 1972.

Table 2 -- Blacks as A Proportion of Total Population, 1950-1970

Urbanized Area	Total Urbanized Area			Central City or Cities			Suburban Ring		
	1970	1960	1950	1970	1960	1950	1970	1960	1950
New York	14.9%	10.9%	8.1%	22.6%	14.9%	9.7%	5.9%	4.5%	3.9%
Los Angeles	9.2	7.1	5.4	16.5	12.2	7.9	4.8	3.2	2.3
Chicago	19.6	16.1	11.6	32.8	23.0	13.9	3.4	3.0	2.9
Philadelphia	19.8	17.3	14.8	33.6	26.4	18.1	6.9	6.1	6.7
Detroit	19.0	15.6	12.8	43.6	28.9	16.2	3.7	3.8	5.8
San Francisco	11.2	9.5	7.0	20.5	14.3	7.9	6.0	5.5	5.9
Boston	4.7	3.2	2.3	16.3	9.1	5.0	1.1	0.8	0.8
Washington	27.0	24.9	23.9	71.1	53.9	35.0	7.6	3.7	5.4
Cleveland	17.0	14.5	10.9	38.3	28.6	16.2	3.7	0.9	0.5
St. Louis	19.4	17.0	14.6	40.9	28.6	17.9	8.9	7.6	9.5
Pittsburgh	8.5	8.0	7.7	20.2	16.7	12.2	3.9	3.6	4.0
Minneapolis	1.9	1.5	1.3	4.0	2.5	1.5	0.2	0.1	0.1
Houston	20.4	20.7	19.4	25.7	22.9	20.9	5.8	10.5	10.7
Baltimore	28.0	24.1	20.6	46.4	34.6	23.4	3.2	3.5	8.1
Dallas	16.5	14.6	14.2	24.9	19.0	13.1	2.2	2.6	18.7
Milwaukee	8.5	5.5	2.6	14.7	8.4	3.4	0.2	0.2	0.1
Seattle	3.4	3.2	2.6	7.1	4.8	3.4	0.5	0.2	0.4
Miami	14.7	13.4	12.1	22.7	22.4	16.2	11.7	8.7	7.4
San Diego	5.0	4.3	3.7	7.9	6.0	4.5	1.4	0.7	1.3
Atlanta	25.1	27.1	28.1	51.3	38.3	36.6	5.8	7.6	12.1
Cincinnati	13.5	12.9	11.5	27.6	21.6	15.5	3.8	3.9	4.8
Kansas City	13.5	12.4	12.1	22.3	17.5	12.2	6.1	7.0	11.9
Buffalo	9.8	7.7	4.5	20.4	13.3	6.3	2.0	2.0	1.0
Denver	4.7	3.8	3.1	9.1	6.1	3.6	0.4	0.3	0.7
San Jose	1.7	0.7	0.5	2.5	1.0	0.6	1.2	0.5	0.3
New Orleans	32.0	31.2	29.4	45.0	37.2	31.9	10.9	14.0	13.9
Portland	2.8	2.5	2.1	8.3	4.4	2.6	0.3	0.3	0.8
Indianapolis	16.4	15.4	12.7	18.0	20.6	15.0	0.2	0.4	0.2
Providence	2.6	2.0	1.7	8.9	5.4	3.3	0.7	0.5	0.5
Total[a]	14.4	12.1	9.9	25.9	19.1	12.7	4.6	3.7	4.1

[a]Weighted by the size of the urbanized area.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, PC(1)-B, Table 23; Census of Population: 1960, PC(1)-B, Table 21; Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, Table 34.

As quoted by Albert I. Hermalin and Reynolds Farley, "The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy." American Sociological Review 38 (October): 599.

Table 3 — Blacks or Nonwhites as A Proportion of Total Public Elementary School Enrollment; 1970 and 1960[a]

Urbanized Area	Total Urbanized Area		Central City		Suburban Ring	
	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960
New York	22.7%	16.5%	40.0%	26.1%	5.5%	6.1%
Los Angeles	12.2	10.3	23.6	19.1	6.8	5.2
Chicago	30.0	27.5	54.8	42.6	4.8	4.6
Philadelphia	31.5	29.6	61.1	50.1	10.5	10.0
Detroit	23.4	22.2	64.3	45.8	4.5	5.6
San Francisco	16.2	19.9	40.0	39.3	7.9	9.6
Boston	6.8	5.1	31.9	18.6	1.1	1.2
Washington	34.2	32.8	93.3	79.9	10.4	5.9
Cleveland	25.7	23.0	57.1	47.5	5.4	1.5
St. Louis	29.9	28.5	65.2	50.6	13.9	13.1
Pittsburgh	13.7	13.7	41.9	36.2	5.7	6.1
Minneapolis	2.4	2.6	7.6	5.3	0.2	0.4
Houston	24.8	23.3	32.1	26.5	7.1	11.5
Baltimore	40.6	36.1	66.8	52.5	4.2	5.6
Dallas	20.9	16.1	34.3	21.6	2.3	2.9
Milwaukee	14.3	11.0	27.7	18.0	0.2	0.4
Seattle	4.3	6.6	13.0	11.5	0.5	0.8
Miami	24.9	18.5	38.1	34.2	20.8	12.6
San Diego	7.1	7.1	11.7	10.4	1.4	1.8
Atlanta	29.7	31.1	65.2	45.5	7.6	9.8
Cincinnati	20.5	20.8	45.8	34.2	5.5	6.4
Kansas City	18.3	15.5	32.4	24.2	7.7	8.4
Buffalo	16.0	13.9	39.5	27.7	3.2	3.7
Denver	6.1	5.1	15.2	9.1	0.5	0.7
San Jose	2.2	2.8	3.2	3.0	1.4	2.7
New Orleans	48.5	48.0	68.6	57.7	18.8	24.4
Portland	3.9	4.7	9.8	8.7	0.3	0.8
Indianapolis	21.3	19.2	23.4	27.0	0.1	0.4
Providence	4.8	4.0	19.2	12.7	1.8	0.8
Total[b]	20.7	18.4	41.7	32.4	6.3	5.7

[a]Data for 1960 refer to nonwhites; for 1970, to blacks.

[b]Weighted by the size of the urbanized area.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1960, PC(1)-C, Tables 73 and 77; Census of Population: 1970, PC(1)-C, Tables 83 and 91.

As quoted by Albert I. Hermalin and Reynolds Farley, "The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy." American Sociological Review 38 (October): 600.

REFERENCES

Allport, Gordan. 1954. The Nature of Prejudice. Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Banks, Olive. 1968. The Sociology of Education. New York: Schocken Books.

Berea College v. Kentucky, 211, U. S. 26 (1908).

Brookover, Wilbur B., and Edsel Erickson. 1975. Sociology of Education. Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Cohen, Elizabeth. 1975. "The Effects of Desegregation on Race Relations." Law and Contemporary Problems 39 Part II (Winter): 271-299.

Coleman, James. 1975. "Recent Trends in School Integration." Educational Researcher 4(July-August): 3-12.

Crain, Robert L. and Carol Sachs Weisman. 1972. Discrimination, Personality, and Achievement. New York: Seminar Press.

Epps, Edgar. 1975. "Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality." Law and Contemporary Problems 39 Part II (Winter): 300-313.

Foster, Gordon. 1973. "Desegregating Urban Schools: A Review of Techniques." Harvard Educational Review 43(Fegruary): 5-36.

Gorman, Benjamin. 1971. Social Themes. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Green, Robert L. 1974. "Northern School Desegregation: Educational, Legal, and Political Issues." Pp. 213-273 in Uses of The Sociology of Education edited by C. Wayne Gordon. Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Grodzins, Morton. 1958. The Metropolitan Area as a Racial Problem. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Havighurst, Robert. 1967. "These Integration Approaches Work - Sometime," The Nation's Schools 80 (September): 73-75.

Henderson, Ronald D., and J. J. Gomez. 1975. "The Consolidation of Rural Schools: Reasons, Results, and Implications -- A Preliminary Investigation." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of Rural Sociological Society, San Francisco, California.

Hermalin, Albert I. and Reynolds Farley. 1973. "The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy." American Sociological Review 38 (October): 595-610.

Jones, Leon. 1974. "Desegregation and Social Reform Since 1954." The Journal of Negro Education 43 (Spring): 155-171.

Lindquist, Robert, 1974. "The Supreme Court Considers a School Desegregation Remedy for Metropolitan Areas: Bradley v. Milliken." Educational Researchers 3 (June): 10-12.

Lindquist, Robert. 1975. "Bradley v. Milliken: Was Busing Really the Question?" Educational Researcher 4 (March): 16-20.

Mercer, Jane R., Marietta Coleman, and Jack Harloe. 1974. "Racial/Ethnic Segregation and Desegregation in American Public Education." Pp. 274-329 in Uses of the Sociology of Education, edited by C. Wayne Gordon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Milliken v. Bradley, 418 U. S. 717 (1974).

Orfield, Gary. 1975. "How to Make Desegregation Work: The Adaptation of Schools to Their Newly - Integrated Student Bodies." Law and Contemporary Problems 39 Part I (Winter): 314-340.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U. S. 537 (1896).

Rodriguez v. San Antonio, 411 U. S. 1 (1973).

Smith, Charles U., and Charles M. Grigg. 1974. "Public School Desegregation in the South." Pp. 330-379 in Uses of the Sociology of Education, edited by C. Wayne Gordon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Spady, Bill. 1974. "The Authority System of the School and Student Unrest: A Theoretical Exploration." Pp. 36-77 in Uses of the Sociology of Education edited by C. Wayne Gordon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

St. John, Nancy H. 1975. School Desegregation Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

St. John, Nancy H., and Ralph G. Lewis. 1975. "Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom." Sociology of Education 48 (Summer): 346-368.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 28 (1971).

Weinberg, Meyer. 1964. "De Facto Segregation: Fact or Antifact." Pp. 133-153 in Learning Together, edited by Meyer Weinberg. Chicago: Integrated Education Association.

Wisdom, John Minor. 1975. "Random Remarks on The Role of Social Science in The Judicial Decision-Making Process in School Desegregation Cases." Law and Contemporary Problems 39 Part I (Winter): 134-156.

Wolf, Robert L. and Rita J. Simon. 1975. "Does Busing Improve the Racial Interaction of Children?" Educational Researcher 4 (January): 5-10.

Young, Biloine Whiting, and Grace Billings Bress. 1975. "A New Educational Decision: Is Detroit the End of the School Bus Line?" Phi Delta Kappen 56 (April): 515-520.